

1 John A. Vogt (State Bar No. 198677)  
2 javogt@jonesday.com  
3 Edward S. Chang (State Bar No. 241682)  
4 echang@jonesday.com  
5 JONES DAY  
6 3161 Michelson Drive, Suite 800  
7 Irvine, California 92612  
8 Telephone: (949) 851-3939  
9 Facsimile: (949) 553-7539

10 Attorneys for Defendant  
11 INTELIUS INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
13 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
14 SOUTHERN DIVISION

15 LISA LIBERI, et al.,  
16 Plaintiffs,  
17 v.  
18 ORLY TAITZ, et al.,  
19 Defendants.

Case No. 8:11-CV-00485-AG (AJWx)  
Assigned for all purposes to  
Honorable Andrew J. Guilford

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE  
IN SUPPORT OF INTELIUS'  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT**

Date: March 12, 2012  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Dept: 10 D

**REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that, under Federal Rule of Evidence 201, and in support of its Motion for Summary Judgment, Intelius Inc. respectfully requests that the Court take Judicial Notice of the following public record, which is not subject to reasonable dispute because it is capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned:

1. The Notice of Ruling, and accompanying Order, of the Honorable Kevin C. Brazile, dated January 17, 2012, sustaining the Demurrer of Intelius Inc. without leave to amend pursuant to the Communications Decency Act, in the matter Geller, et al. v. Intelius, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 453778, a true and correct copy of which is attached as Exhibit 1 hereto.

**ARGUMENT**

“A court shall take judicial notice if requested by a party and supplied with the necessary information.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(d). “A judicially noticed fact must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot be reasonably questioned.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b).

The Court may “take judicial notice of undisputed matters of public record.” Wilbur v. Locke, 423 F.3d 1101, 1113 (9th Cir. 2005) (brackets omitted). The aforementioned document is not reasonably subject to dispute—it is a public record—an Order of the Superior Court—in a matter that is pending before the Los Angeles Superior Court. Thus, it is the proper subject of judicial notice under the Federal Rules of Evidence.

**CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, Intelius respectfully requests that, in connection with its Motion for Summary Judgment, the Court take judicial notice of the Notice of Ruling, and accompanying Order, of the Honorable Kevin C. Brazile, dated January 17, 2012, sustaining the Demurrer of Intelius Inc. without leave to amend pursuant to the Communications Decency Act, in the matter Geller, et al. v. Intelius, et al., Los Angeles Superior Court Case No. BC 453778.

Dated: February 10, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY

By: /s/ John A. Vogt

John A. Vogt

ATTORNEYS FOR INTELIOUS INC.